

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
POWER
LOK SABHA**

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:511
ANSWERED ON:20.02.2003
UNSPENT PROVISION IN MINISTRY
SHEESH RAM SINGH RAVI

Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

- (a) whether large provisions made in the budget remains unspent in his Ministry;
- (b) if so, the details thereof for each of the last three years and the reasons therefor; and
- (c) its impact on the pending power projects and the steps taken to accelerate the use of the provisions?

Answer

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTI MEHTA)

(a) & (b) : The details of the unspent provisions in the Ministry and the reasons thereof are given below :-

Year (Rs. in crores)	Organization	Saving	Reason
1999-2000	NJPC	93	Due to strike by workers of the main civil works contractor, unrest by local villagers on rehabilitation issues and poor conditions of NH-22.
	Sardar Sarovar	37.27	The saving of Rs. 37.27 crore was due to non-receipt of the share from the Govt. of M.P. Government of India has already released a sum of Rs. 297.4 crore as per the decision of the Government to fund the project in the ratio of 1.28:1 between GOI and GOMP.
	BTPS	9.62	Due to delay in awarding contracts for ash utilization and R&M work.
	THDC	18	Due to delay in approval of new project, i.e., Koteshwar HEP.
	REC	59.17	REC is providing funds for energisation of the pumpsets and system improvement to SEBs. Since there were less claims from the SEBs, the total budget was not utilised by REC.
	PGCIL	74.52	The saving of Rs. 74.52 crore was due to delay in the execution of the NJPC project due to reasons indicated above. Hence there was deferment of supply and erection in the transmission system to match with the generation schedule. In addition, there was a saving of Rs. 20.56 crores on the ULDC-NR Project due to delay in type testing and consequent slippage of supplies. It may, however, be indicated that the ULDC-NR project was commissioned ahead of schedule.
2000-01	PGCIL	50	The saving of Rs.50 crore occurred due to change in the funding pattern of the scheme of the ULDC NER. The revised proposal was not approved by Competent Authority.
	PGCIL	41.79	The saving of Rs. 41.79 crore was due to non approval of the extension of the NRTS-IBRD Loan (3237 IN), provided for NJPC-TL,

REC 91.84 REC is providing funds for energisation of the pumpsets and system improvement to SEBs. Since there were less claims from the SEBs, the total budget was not utilised by REC.
Rural 12.53 The saving of Rs.12.53 crore was due to non approval of the scheme of Rural electrification of Dalit Basti in NER.

NEEPCO 122 Due to slow progress in infrastructure work and delay in awards in contracts for Turial HEP (60MW) for technical reasons. In addition, Kameng, Kopili, Tuivai, Lower Kopili, and Tipaimukh HEP could not get the investment approval from the competent authority in time.

2001-02 Kutir Jyoti 15 As per the instruction, the 50% of the grant is to be released in advance and 50% on reimbursement basis to SEBs for implementation of single point connection in the villages. Less claims from the SEBs resultant saving.

PGCIL 40 The saving of Rs. 40 crore occurred due to change in the funding pattern of the scheme of ULDC NER. The revised proposal was not approved by Competent Authority. The consequent change in funding pattern required a fresh PIB/CCEA approval in the absence of this, the funds earmarked as grants could not be utilised.

Sardar 36.27 The saving was due to non-receipt of the shares from the Govt. of M.P., Government of India has already released a sum of Rs. 297.4 crore as per the decision of the Government to fund the project in the ratio of 1.28:1. Since RCE of the project was not approved, therefore the saving

PTC 50 An amount of Rs.50 crore is provided to PTC as equity. Later on it was decided to re-structure the company with equity participation from NTPC, PGCIL, etc.

REC 410 The amount was provided as loan to REC for village electrification and system improvement. Since the scheme was merged with PMGY the funds were released by the MOF, hence technically there was no surrender, in effect.

(c) : As already explained in the reasons given above for each case, it is to be noted that release of funds from the budget is linked to specific milestones of action. In every case where the budget provision could not be fully utilized, it occurred because of non-fulfillment of the conditions prescribed for release of the funds. It is very difficult to separate out the impact due to this aspect alone from many other factors which together impact the execution of any project.

With regard to steps for accelerating the utilization of the budget provision, the Ministry is continuously monitoring the trend of expenditure and making reviews with the concerned project authorities every quarter to make sure that non-availability of funds do not become a constraint in implementation of the concerned project.